TJS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMES EVERETT SHELTON 316 Covered Bridge Road King of Prussia, PA 19406

Plaintiff

v.

ICAPITAL CASH GROUP INC., a New York corporation LCF GROUP, LLC, a New York corporation LAST CHANCE FUNDING INC., a New York corporation ED ORE, individually and as an Officer of iCapital GARY DAMICO, individually and as an Officer of iCapital EDWARD SAMWAYS, , individually and as an officer of iCapital

411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552

and Does 1-100, inclusive

Defendants

Civil Action No. **17 2620**

COMPLAINT:

This is an action brought by Plaintiff JAMES EVERETT SHELTON for damages, statutory damages, interest, court costs, and injunctive relief under rights pursuant to Federal Statute 47 U.S.C. 227, and 47 C.F.R. 64 ("Federal Question" Jurisdiction) for the *ultra vires* illegal actions and deliberate and knowing tortious activity of ICAPITAL CASH GROUP INC. (iCapital), LCF GROUP, LLC (LCF), LAST CHANCE FUNDING INC., ED ORE, GARY DAMICO, EDWARD SAMWAYS, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively, "Company") in

negligently and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff via Plaintiff's telephone to solicit sales ("Sales Calls"), by utilization of an automatic telephone dialing system ("RoboCalls") in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury, and complains and alleges as follows:

I. Introduction

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action to challenge the Company's practices in the telephone solicitation of its products and services. Specifically, Plaintiff challenges Company's and Company's agents' illegal telephone solicitations and RoboCalls made by an automatic telephone dialing system by which it markets its products and services, and failure to maintain a Do-Not-Call policy or list in connection therewith.
- 2. All of the claims asserted herein arise out of Company's illegal telephone solicitation campaign and are a common fact pattern.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- **4.** Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), in that Defendant conducts business in, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to plaintiff's claims occurred in, Pennsylvania's Montgomery County, which lies within this judicial district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §118. Also, see *Lary V. The Doctors Answer, LLC* CV-12-S-3510-NE (N.D. Ala. March 8, 2013.), a Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act case, which held that "venue is proper in the district where [plaintiff] resides because the injury did not occur when the facsimile was sent...; it occurred when the [facsimile] was received.

III. Parties

- 5. Plaintiff JAMES EVERETT SHELTON ("Plaintiff") is an individual who received the alleged phone calls on his private mobile telephone line, (484) 626-3942, mentioned herein. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing at 316 Covered Bridge Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406.
- 6. Defendant ICAPITAL CASH GROUP INC. ("iCapital") is a New York corporation that markets, sells, and/or brokers "merchant cash advances" and business loans to businesses throughout the United States, and transacts business in, inter alia, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which lies within this Judicial District. iCapital has a principal mailing address located at 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552
- 7. Defendant LCF GROUP, LLC ("LCF") is a New York corporation that markets, sells, and/or brokers "merchant cash advances" and business loans to businesses throughout the United States, and transacts business in, inter alia, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which lies within this Judicial District. LCF has a principal mailing address at the same location as iCapital, 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552
- **8.** Defendant LAST CHANCE FUNDING INC. is a New York corporation that markets, sells, and/or brokers "merchant cash advances" and business loans to businesses throughout the United States, and transacts business in, inter alia, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which lies within this Judicial District. Company has a principal mailing address at the same location as iCapital and LCF, 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552.
- 9. Defendant ED ORE is an adult individual and an Officer and/or business funding Executive of the Company. He may be served at the principal office of the Company, 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552.

- 10. Defendant EDWARD SAMWAYS is an adult individual and an Officer and/or business funding Executive of the Company. He may be served at the principal office of the Company, 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552.
- 11. Defendant GARY DAMICO is an adult individual and an Officer and/or business funding Executive of the Company. He may be served at the principal office of the Company, 411 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, New York 11552.
- 1. Except as described herein, Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names of Defendants sued as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and the nature of their wrongful conduct, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 2. At all times herein mentioned, iCapital, LCF, Last Chance Funding, Ore, Samways, Damico, and the Doe Defendants, (collectively, "Defendants"), and each of them, were an agent or joint venture of each of the other, and in doing the acts alleged herein, were acting within the scope of such agency. Each Defendant had actual and/or constructive knowledge of the acts of each of the other Defendants, and ratified, approved, joined in, acquiesced and/or authorized the wrongful acts of each co-Defendant, and/or retained the benefits of said wrongful acts.
- 3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants conspired by means of mutual understanding, either expressly or impliedly, among themselves and others in engaging and/or planning to engage in the activities detailed herein to accomplish the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

IV. Factual Allegations

4. Standing is proper under Article III of the Constitution of the United States of

America because Plaintiff's claims state: a.) a valid injury in fact, b.) which is traceable to the conduct of the defendants, and c.) and is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision. See, Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. ___ (2016) at 6, and Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 at 560. 29."

- 5. In or about May 16, 2016, Plaintiff received the first of multiple telephone solicitations by Defendants and/or their agents at Plaintiff's personal mobile telephone, 484-626-3942. Plaintiff had not consented to this solicitation.
- **6.** The incoming call displayed caller identification showing 646-793-9096, and upon answering, Plaintiff heard a pause and a "pop", before he was connected with "Gary" at iCapital.
- 7. The unsolicited telephone call was placed to Plaintiff's personal mobile telephone number and utilized an "automatic telephone dialing system" to transmit a message, as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).
- 8. The telephone call was made by an automatic telephone dialing system because there was a delay before the company agent, Gary, answered the phone, and because Plaintiff heard a characteristic "pop" before he was connected.
- 9. Plaintiff pays for each incoming and outgoing call on his telephone under an unlimited calling arrangement, as defined and set forth in 47 CFR § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii).
- **10.** Plaintiff's telephone number was on the National Do-Not-Call registry since 2015.
- 11. Plaintiff spoke to the agent, "Gary" that answered and confirmed corporate identity with the agent, including company website and address.
 - 12. Plaintiff received an e-mail confirming the identity of the caller.

- 13. Plaintiff received another RoboCall call from Defendants on May 30, this time from "Eddie" (Defendant Edward Samways). Plaintiff's caller ID read 215-325-9039. Plaintiff received an e-mail from Eddie, once again confirming the caller's identity.
- 14. Plaintiff understood the call to be a RoboCall placed using an automatic telephone dialing system because he heard a pre-recorded message, and Plaintiff first spoke with another unknown individual who "pre-qualified" Plaintiff for a business loan, and subsequently transferred Plaintiff to Defendants.
- 15. Plaintiff was not interested in Defendant's services or sales pitch and never consented to receive additional calls.
- **16.** However, "Eddie" called Plaintiff again the following day, May 31. Plaintiff requested that Eddie send Plaintiff an e-mail confirming his identity.
- 17. Plaintiff reiterated through electronic mail to Eddie that he did not wish to receive any more calls, and requested that the Defendants place his number on the company Do-Not-Call list and provide Plaintiff with a copy of the Defendant's internal Do-Not-Call policy.
- 18. Defendants failed and/or refused to comply with Plaintiff's reasonable written request.
- 19. On June 6, Plaintiff received another call from Defendants- this time from "Gary". Plaintiff's caller ID read 646-793-9096.
- **20.** Plaintiff received two more calls from the Defendants the next day, June 7, and received another call on June 8.
- 21. Plaintiff was fed up with receiving these annoying and disruptive calls and e-mailed defendants again to inform them to stop calling. Plaintiff notified Defendants of the impending litigation. Plaintiff offered Defendants the opportunity to settle this matter for a

nominal sum, to no avail. Defendants telephoned Plaintiff shortly thereafter on an unknown number and the parties were not able to reach an amicable settlement.

- **22.** Despite demand, Defendants failed to place Plaintiff's telephone number on Company's internal Do-Not-Call list.
- 23. These telephone solicitations constituted "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes.
- 24. Plaintiff did not provide any one, more, or all Defendants, nor any agent of Defendants, prior express written consent, or any other form of consent, express or implied, to cause Plaintiff to receive telephone calls for sales purposes on his personal mobile telephone. Plaintiff never provided his contact information to Company on an inquiry form, online or otherwise.
 - 25. Plaintiff had no prior business relationship with any one, more, or all of Defendants.
 - 26. The RoboCalls violated various portions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 and 47 CFR § 64.1200.

First Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Sales Call" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **27.** Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **28.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F).
- 29. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

Second Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "Sales Call" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **30.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- 31. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).
- 32. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

Third Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "RoboCall" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- 33. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above
- 34. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et. seq., Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the private right of action.

Fourth Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "RoboCall" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

35. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

36. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Fifth Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call Policy" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- 37. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- 38. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Sixth Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call Policy" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- **39.** Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **40.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1) Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as implied, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Seventh Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- **41.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
 - 42. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47

CFR 64.1200(d)(3), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Eighth Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- **43.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **44.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3) Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as implied, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

I. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Causes of Action 1-8:

- 1. For awards of \$500 for each negligent violation as set forth in actions 1-8;
- 2. For awards of \$1,500 for each knowing and/or willful violation as set forth in actions 1-8.
- 3. Injunctive relief against Defendants, and each of them, to prevent future wrongdoing; Total statutory damages: \$24,000(Seven counts each of: Sales Call, Robocall, and one count each for: Failure to put Plaintiff's number on Company's internal Do-Not-Call list, and Failure to Provide a Written Copy of Defendant's Do-Not-Call policy, with treble damages for each).

For All Causes of Action:

- 4. Prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate;
- 5. Costs of suit herein incurred; and
- 6. All such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

V. <u>Demand for Jury Trial</u>

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Dated: 6/9/2017

James Everett Shelton Plaintiff Pro Se 316 Covered Bridge Road King of Prussia, PA 19406 (484) 626-3942 jamieshelton66@yahoo.com

James & Shelton

Case 2:17-cv-02620-TJS Document 1 Filed 06/09/17 Page 12 of 14 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTION	IS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS	S FORM.)	or i, is required for the use of	
JAMES EVERE JUSHEL 316 COVERED BRIDGE KING OF PRUSSIA PA (b) County of Residence of	ROAD 19406	ITGOMERY	WEST HEMPSTE County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND CO	BROUP INC. TURNPIKE, SUITE 100 AD, NEW YORK 11552	NASSAU ONLY)
JAMES EVERETT SHEL 316 COVERED BRIDGE	Address, and Telephone Number) LTON, PLAINTIFF PRO SI ROAD 19406 PHONE: 484-626-3		Attorneys (If Known) Unknown	-	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Bo	x Only) III.	CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a	Party) C	(For Diversity Cases Only) Pl Citizen of This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of I	Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	of Business In	Another State
		С	itizen or Subject of a D Foreign Country	3	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJURY 65 Personal Injury - Product Liability 67 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 68 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 28 SONAL PROPERTY 70 Other Fraud 71 Truth in Lending 80 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability 18 SONER PETITIONS 16 Alien Detainee 10 Motions to Vacate Sentence 30 General 35 Death Penalty 10 Product Liability 10 Motions to Vacate Sentence 10 Motions to Vacate	J 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 J 690 Other	322 Appeal 28 USC 158	□ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ▼ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute to Federal Telephone Court Court Federal Telephone Court Fede	ander which you are filing onsumer Protection a sintiff on his private to CLASS ACTION	(specify) g (Do not cite jurisdictional state Act, 47 U.S. Code § 22	District Litigation Transfer tes unless diversity: 7 et seq., and 47 C.F.R. the FTCPA and related	Litigation - Direct File § 64.1200 et seq. claims. if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY				DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 06/09/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	SI	GNATURE OF ATTORNE	y of record Shelton		
	fOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	OGE

Case 2:17-cv-02620 NT 1 Pag 1 Pof 14 2620

FOR THE PASTERNOISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 316 Covered Bridge	Road King of Prussia PA 19406		
	rnpike, Suite 100, West Hempstead, NY 11552		
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction			
,	(Use Reverse Side Fo	or Additional Space)	
Does this civil action involve a nongovern	mental corporate party with any parent corporatio	n and any publicly held corporation ownir	ng 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Sta	tement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a)) Yes□	No D
Does this case involve multidistrict litigati	on possibilities?	Yes□	No
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	•		·
Case Number:	Judge	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is	answered to any of the following questions:		
1. Is this case related to property included	in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	e year previously terminated action in this	court?
		Yes□	No
2. Does this case involve the same issue o action in this court?	f fact or grow out of the same transaction as a price	or suit pending or within one year previous	sly terminated
action in this court:		Yes□	Not
3. Does this case involve the validity or in	fringement of a patent already in suit or any earlie		
terminated action in this court?		Yes□	Nou
A. To this case a second on auguspassive holes		ahta aaga filad bu tha sama individual?	
4. Is this case a second of successive habe	as corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil ri	yes□	Nob
		Yes⊔	NOE
CIVIL: (Place 🗸 in ONE CATEGORY	ONLY)		
A. Federal Question Cases:		B. Diversity Jurisdiction Case.	s:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine C	contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract a	and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA		2. Airplane Personal In	njury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury		3. □ Assault, Defamation	1
4. □ Antitrust		4. □ Marine Personal Inj	urv
5. □ Patent		5. □ Motor Vehicle Perso	
6. □ Labor-Management Relations		6. □ Other Personal Injur	-
7. □ Civil Rights		7. □ Products Liability	y (r rease speers)
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus		8. Products Liability —	Ashastas
•		-	
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases		9. □ All other Diversity (ases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases		(Please specify)	
11. X All other Federal Question Ca (Please specify) Federal Telepho			
	ARBITRATION CER (Check Appropriate		
, James Everett Shelton	counsel of record do hereby cer	3 ,	
	ction 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge an	d belief, the damages recoverable in this c	ivil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs Relief other than monetary damages	· /\ > -	Shalton	
2 Rener outer than monetary damages		PLAINTIF	E DD O SE
DATE: 6/9/2017	James Everett Shelton	T LAINTIF	r rko se
NOT	Attorney-at-Law E: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the		rney I.D.# 3.
certify that, to my knowledge, the with	n case is not related to any case now pending o	or within one year previously terminated	l action in this court
except as noted above.		E Shelten	
DATE: 6/92017	James Everett Shelton	PLAINTII	FF PRO SE
	Attorney-at-Law	Attor	nev I.D.#



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

JAMES EVERETT SHELTON

CIVIL ACTION

v.

ICAPITAL CASH GROUP INC.

NO. 17

2620

()

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.

Telephone FAX Number		E-Mail Address	E-Mail Address		
(484) 626-3942		jamieshelton66@yahoo.con	1		
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for			
6/9/2017	James Everett Shelton	PLAINTIFF PRO SE			
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into an	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(X)		
commonly referred to	- Cases that do not fall into trace as complex and that need species side of this form for a detailed	al or intense management by	()		
(d) Asbestos – Cases invo exposure to asbestos.	lving claims for personal injury	or property damage from	()		
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
	Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health uman Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.				
	•	•			

(Civ. 660) 10/02